UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, ps 422 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 424 Spokane WA 99201

COPY MAILED

OCT 3 1 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Edward A. Hubbard

Application No.: 09/834785

Filing or 371(c) Date: 04/13/2001

Attorney Docket Number: NING0008

DECISION ON

PETITION

This is a decision in response to the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137, filed September 18, 2008. The petition is properly treated as a renewed petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment based upon failure to receive an Office action under 37 CFR 1.181.

This Petition is hereby dismissed.

Any further petition must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under [insert the applicable code section]." This is **not** final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to timely and properly reply to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due (Notice"), mailed July 25, 2006. The Notice set a three (3) month period for reply. No extensions of time were available. No reply having been received, the application became abandoned on October 26, 2006. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed December 26, 2006.

February 23, 2007 Petition under 37 CFR 1.181

Petitioner, the law firm of Fish & Richardson, filed a petition on February 23, 2007 and asserted that the Notice was never received. In support of this assertion, Petitioner stated that a search of the physical file and docket records indicated that the Notice was not received. Petitioner also filed a copy of a docket record from the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick, the attorneys of record at the time the Notice was mailed. A review of the copy of the docket records from Winstead Sechrest & Minick indicated that the Notice was not received. No statement from anyone at the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick, attesting to a search of the file jacket and docket records has been conducted, or that the search of the physical file and docket records indicate that the Notice was not receive, was filed.

Application No.: 09/834785 Page 2

It was also noted that the law firm of Fish & Richardson were no longer the attorneys of record in the application.

August 22, 2008 Decision dismissing petition

The petition was dismissed in a Decision mailed August 22, 2008. The Decision dismissing the petition noted that no statement from anyone at the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick, attesting to non-receipt of the Notice, or attesting to a search of the file jacket and docket records, or that the search of the physical file and docket records indicate that the Notice was not receive, was filed. Moreover, no copy of the master docket for the firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick was filed. A statement from a person with knowledge of the docketing system at the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick, attesting to non-receipt of the Notice, or attesting to a search of the file jacket and docket records, or that the search of the physical file and docket records indicate that the Notice was not receive, was required. Also, a copy of the master docket record showing all replies docketed for a date three (3) months from the mail date of the Notice was required.

The present renewed petition

Applicant files the present renewed petition, co-executed by Robert A. Voigt Jr., of the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick, asserting that the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick does not maintain a Master Docket for all its docketed items. Applicant refers to Exhibit "B", the individual docket record for the application in question.

Applicable Law, Rules and MPEP

The MPEP 711.03(c)A, Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment Based on Failure To Receive Office Action, provides

In Delgar v. Schulyer, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of Delgar, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of Delgar is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133). To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the

Application No.: 09/834785 Page 3

response. Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required. A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question. The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions). (Emphasis supplied)

MPEP 711.03(c)

<u>Analysis</u>

Applicant asserts that the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick does not maintain a Master Docket for all its docketed items. In view of this assertion, and the unavailability o a copy of the master docket record, the Office is unable to account for the situation where the Office action may have been received and mis-docketed. Further to this, it is noted that the law firm of Winstead Sechrest & Minick uses a post office box for receipt of correcpondence from this Office. Accordingly, as noted in the Decision dismissing the petition mailed August 22, 2008, a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO, is required. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. The statement should address the process whereby correspondence from this Office and received at the post office box is entered into the relevant application files. Petitioner is reminded that the showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail.

The petition is dismissed without prejudice. Applicant should file a Request for Reconsideration of Petition and include the necessary statement(s), copies of docket records and/or file jacket.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Director for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Application No.: 09/834785 Page 4

By FAX:

(571) 273-8300

Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand:

Customer Service Window

Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3232.

/Derek L. Woods/ Derek L. Woods Attorney Office of Petitions